

ADA 079215

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM 61-16

REVISION OF WAC OCS
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION BLANK
AND APPLICANT EVALUATION REPORT

OCTOBER 1961

LEVEL 14

DDC FILE COPY

DDC
RECEIVED
DEC 20 1979
A

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited



HUMAN FACTORS RESEARCH BRANCH

79 12 18 293

Army Project Number
2L95-60-001

Attrition Reduction d-00

④ *memos*
Research Memorandum 61-16
⑥ REVISION OF WAC OCS BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION BLANK
AND APPLICANT EVALUATION REPORT

⑩ Aaron Katz
James B. Trump, Task Leader

⑭ AGO-HFRB-RM-61-16

⑫ 61

Submitted

Edmund F. Fuchs
Chief, Military Selection Research Laboratory

Accession For	
NTIS GAINI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	<input type="checkbox"/>
1/	
2/	
3/	
4/	
5/	
6/	
7/	
8/	
9/	
10/	
11/	
12/	
13/	
14/	
15/	
16/	
17/	
18/	
19/	
20/	
21/	
22/	
23/	
24/	
25/	
26/	
27/	
28/	
29/	
30/	
31/	
32/	
33/	
34/	
35/	
36/	
37/	
38/	
39/	
40/	
41/	
42/	
43/	
44/	
45/	
46/	
47/	
48/	
49/	
50/	
51/	
52/	
53/	
54/	
55/	
56/	
57/	
58/	
59/	
60/	
61/	
62/	
63/	
64/	
65/	
66/	
67/	
68/	
69/	
70/	
71/	
72/	
73/	
74/	
75/	
76/	
77/	
78/	
79/	
80/	
81/	
82/	
83/	
84/	
85/	
86/	
87/	
88/	
89/	
90/	
91/	
92/	
93/	
94/	
95/	
96/	
97/	
98/	
99/	
100/	

⑪
Oct 1961

This document is intended for use only by The Adjutant General, ACTL,
and is not available for distribution.

003 650

REVISION OF WAC OCS BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION BLANK
AND APPLICANT EVALUATION REPORT

Abstract
The WAC Officer Candidate Biographical Information Blank was developed and introduced operationally in 1948. Upon recent examination, much of the content was found to be obsolete or inappropriate, especially in terminology. Scoring was evidently based on analogy to the male OCS BIB. Both Rights and Wrongs keys were applied to the MOST APPLICABLE and LEAST APPLICABLE sections of Part III and a constant was added to avoid negative scores. Revision of the WAC OCS BIB was obviously in order.

In connection with the planned revision, all instruments for selection of input to OCS and to the WAC Officer Reserve were reexamined. The BIB is common to the WAC OCS selection battery and to the battery for appointment to commissions in the U. S. Army Reserve. The OCS procedures include in addition an Evaluation Report and a standard interview. The Reserve program includes the same standard interview and an Appraisal Sheet instead of the Evaluation Report.

Abstract
The WAC Officer Candidate Applicant Evaluation Report, dated 1 November 1957, appeared to require considerable revision. Some sections, according to action agencies, had no operational impact. The Form was inconveniently arranged in that sections to be completed by any one individual--the adjutant or personnel officer who prepared the form and supplied identification and background data, the rater, the indorser--were scattered throughout the instrument. Further, as in the BIB, scoring for the section made up of MOST and LEAST DESCRIPTIVE phrases necessitated use of both Rights and Wrongs keys and the addition of a constant to avoid negative scores. There was no need to revise the Interview used in both the OCS and Reserve Officer selection programs, nor the Appraisal Sheet used in the Reserve program only.^{1/}

Changes made in the WAC OCS BIB and in the WAC Officer Candidate Applicant Evaluation Report are described in the present Research Memorandum. Changes in scoring of the two instruments and newly established cutting scores for selection to the programs involved are also reported.

REVISION OF THE WAC OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION BLANK

The WAC OCS BIB, DA PRT 890, consisted of three parts, and required two sides of an answer sheet. Part I, with 93 items, was scored by a Rights only key. However, only 14 of the items were scored. In revising the instrument, the 79 unscored items were reviewed to judge similarity of content to that of items found valid in other programs and also for

- 1 -

^{1/} Instruments of the WAC OCS selection battery are used also in selecting enlisted women for commissioning in the RA. The program for appointing officers on active duty to commissions in the RA (Integration) requires administration of the WAC Officer Interview, DA PRT 757, and WAC Officer Biographical Information Blank, DA PRT 752. The Integration procedure is currently little used.

appropriateness to young women. The procedure resulted in the elimination of 55 of the unscored items and the judgment keying of the other 24. In addition, two scored items having a large number of alternatives were each split into two separate items. All dated expressions and references to World War II were replaced by generally familiar present-day terms. The revised Part I contains 40 items, all scored with a Rights key.

Part II of the original BIB consisted of 20 four-choice items. For each item, an examinee was required to select the phrase MOST DESCRIPTIVE of herself and the LEAST DESCRIPTIVE. This section was not scored in PRT 890, and has therefore been eliminated from the revised BIB.

Part III consisted of 42 groups of four statements each. For each group the examinee was required to select the statement MOST APPLICABLE to herself and the LEAST APPLICABLE. Three-level scoring--Rights, Wrongs, and Zero or unscored--was used. In four of the groups, no alternative was scored Right or Wrong. Eight groups were scored for Rights only. The remaining 30 groups were scored both for Rights and Wrongs. The scoring formula for Part III was Rights minus Wrongs plus 60. Considerable administrative gain would come from using a Rights only key, if such scoring could be justified. In the revision, the four groups scored in neither direction were eliminated from the BIB. The remaining 38 groups were reviewed for outdated expressions and edited where necessary, and the keying was revised. Examination of the original Wrongs key showed it to be reflected in the Rights key--all alternatives keyed Wrong as MOST responses were also keyed Right as LEAST responses, and all alternatives key Wrong as LEAST responses were also keyed Right as MOST responses. The alternatives keyed tended to be weighted unduly. The Wrongs key was therefore dropped. In three items, one alternative considered likely to have been affected by the passage of time was dropped from the Rights key, but in each case another keyed response was retained. The 38 items of Part III of the revised BIB are scored with a Rights only key applied to both MOST APPLICABLE and LEAST APPLICABLE statements.

With the reduction in BIB length resulting from elimination of unscored elements, a single side of an answer sheet afforded provision for all responses.

The effect of keying changes on the cutting score was estimated to be an increase of 34 points in earned score. With elimination of the added constant of 60 points, a net reduction of 26 points in the cutting score resulted. As the error of estimate is somewhat gross, the figure was rounded to 30 points reduction for the OCS selection program and 32 points in the direct Reserve commissioning program. Rounding to the larger number was the most conservative procedure in that fewer applicants would be eliminated on that basis.

AR 350-50, c5 and AR 140-30, c9, dated September 1960, introduced the revised WAC Officer Candidate School Biographical Information Blank and changed the composite cutting score for WAC OCS from 200 to 170. The new BIB is DA Form 6215.

DA Pamphlet 611-213-1, SOP for Obtaining Composite Score for Officer Appointment in the Army Reserve, dated 31 August 1960, introduced the revised BIB and changed the required composite cutting score for appointment as a WAC officer in the USAR from 112 to 80.

REVISION OF THE WAC OFFICER CANDIDATE APPLICANT EVALUATION REPORT

The Evaluation Report, DA Form 6226, dated 1 November 1957 contained eight sections. Action agencies were asked which items were used operationally, and on the basis of the replies some of the information required was eliminated-- physical status, citizenship, Arm of Service, and the basis for the rater's evaluation. Layout of the retained elements was modified so that all sections of the Report to be completed by the same individual are continuous.

The scored portion of the previous Report contained 6 scales (3 to be completed by the rater, and 3 by the indorser) which were left unmodified in the revised Report, and a section of 25 groups of four phrases each from which the rater picked one phrase as MOST DESCRIPTIVE of the applicant and another as LEAST DESCRIPTIVE. Three-level scoring--Rights, Wrongs, and Zero-- was applied to these items, and again considerable administrative gain would result from simpler two-level scoring.

In revising the keying of these 25 groups of phrases, the MOST and LEAST DESCRIPTIVE keying for each group was considered at the same time in an attempt to achieve two-level scoring (Rights only) which would still retain the overall effect of the previous three-level scoring. In each of two items (6 and 21), one alternative had been keyed Right as a MOST DESCRIPTIVE response, Wrong as a LEAST DESCRIPTIVE response, whereas the other alternatives were not keyed at all. In the revised key for these items, the same alternative was keyed Right as a MOST DESCRIPTIVE response, and the Wrong scoring was reflected by keying the other three alternatives Right as LEAST DESCRIPTIVE responses. In item 19, where one alternative was keyed Wrong as a MOST DESCRIPTIVE response and Right as a LEAST DESCRIPTIVE response, the revised key retained the Right keying of the alternative as a LEAST DESCRIPTIVE response and keyed the other three alternatives as Right for MOST DESCRIPTIVE responses.

In three items (2, 5, 10), alternatives were scored only as MOST DESCRIPTIVE responses. In item 2, one alternative was originally keyed Wrong as a MOST DESCRIPTIVE response. In the revised key, the other three alternatives were keyed Right as MOST DESCRIPTIVE responses. In addition, the two alternatives which should have positive valence (as LEAST responses) were arbitrarily keyed Right as LEAST DESCRIPTIVE responses. In the case of items 5 and 10, the effect of the original three-level scoring of the MOST DESCRIPTIVE responses was retained by keying Right as MOST DESCRIPTIVE responses the alternatives originally so keyed and by keying Right as LEAST DESCRIPTIVE responses the alternatives which originally had been keyed Wrong as MOST DESCRIPTIVE responses.

In the remaining items, the actual content of the items was considered along with the original keying to retain the impact of the original three-level scoring. Where a response was originally keyed Right, the keying was retained. The content of the alternatives was considered in determining how to reflect the Wrongs keying of alternatives. In some cases, the other alternatives were keyed Right in the same category of response (whether MOST or LEAST), a procedure which resulted in some alternatives being keyed Right as both MOST and LEAST responses. In other items, the alternative originally keyed Wrong was keyed Right in the opposite category of response. This procedure resulted in some alternatives not being keyed at all. In reflecting the Wrong keying, a preference was maintained for keying as Right only alternatives with positive valence (favorable as a MOST DESCRIPTIVE response and unfavorable as a LEAST DESCRIPTIVE response). However, where it was necessary to key a negatively valent alternative as Right, the positively valent alternatives were also keyed Right. Note that a response originally keyed Right is now always keyed Right and that a response originally keyed Wrong is now always unkeyed; responses originally unkeyed are now either unkeyed or keyed Right.

To establish an appropriate cutting score based on the revised keying, the effect of the changes on applicant scores was estimated. In the case of the 22 responses for which two-level scoring (Wrong and Zero) had previously been employed, the present key scores as Zero the response originally scored Wrong and as Right the response originally scored Zero. Key changes result in a straight-forward addition of 1 point per response, or 22 points, to all scores.

For each of the 28 responses originally employing three-level scoring, an estimate was made of the percentage of scores affected by changing a Wrong score to Zero, and a Zero score to Right. The estimate was facilitated by the fact that two alternatives in each item always have negative valence and two have positive valence. Where both positive valence alternatives were affected, p-value of the two was generally estimated as between .70 and .90, the complement being assigned to the other two alternatives. In cases where only one positive alternative within an item was affected, the change was estimated at approximately half the value. The sum of p-value changes for the 50 responses added up to a little over 30 points. Since the error of estimate is undoubtedly gross, the value was rounded to 30.

Circular 611-46, Headquarters, Department of the Army, dated 3 October 1961, introduced the revised WAC OCS Applicant Evaluation Report, DA Form 6226, dated 1 September 1961 and changed the required composite cutting score from 170 to 200. The new form retained the DA Form number of the previous Report. A Rights Key, DA Form 6226-1, replaced previous DA Forms 6226-1 (Rights key) and 6226-2 (Wrongs key).